DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 031 EA 001 848

By- Seaberg, John; Ulibarri, Horacio

Areas of Conflict Between Administrators and Teachers. A New Mexico Report.

New Mexico Univ., Albuquerque. Research and Study Council and Educational Service Center.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note- 41p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.15
Descriptors- *Administrative Personnel, Administrator Selection, Boards of Education, Collective Negotiation, *Conflict, Curriculum, *Decision Making, Educational Facilities, Educational Finance, Instruction, *Policy Formation, Public School Teachers, Questionnaires, *Teacher Associations, Teacher Employment, Teacher Militancy
Identifiers- New Mexico

A study investigated the nature of the conflict between the school administration and teacher organizations over policy formulation and decision making in six New Mexico school districts having both National Education Association (NEA) and American Federation of Teachers (AFT) affiliates. The study sought to determine whether there are differences between the school administration and teachers concerning (1) areas of importance in policy formulation and decision making, (2) the areas in which teachers should be involved in policy formulation and decision making, and (3) the methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals. A three-part questionnaire composed of Likert-type scales was administered to local NEA and AFT affiliate officers and ex-officers and to the upper echelon of the local school administration and members of the local board of education. Conclusions show (1) no significant differences among the administration, NEA affiliate officers, and AFT affiliate officers, regarding areas of importance, (2) significant differences regarding the areas in which teachers should be involved, and (3) a mixed reaction regarding the methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals. Implications of the findings are discussed, with an observation that they are mainly applicable to areas of the United States which are not heavily industrialized and not proximate to strongly unionized organizations. (TT)

Areas of Conflict Between Administrators and Teachers

A New Mexico Report

ED025031

By
JOHN SEABERG
Assistant Director
Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory
And
HORACIO ULIBARRI
Assistant Professor
College of Education
The University of New Mexico

Preface
TOM WILEY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The New Mexico Research and Study Council
College of Education
The University of New Mexico
March, 1968

NEW MEXICO RESEARCH AND STUDY COUNCIL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICE CENTER

Board of Directors

PHILLIP GONZALES, President
Superintendent, Cuba Public Schools

BERNARD BACA, Vice President
Superintendent, Los Lunas Public Schools

RALPH DRAKE, Secretary
Director, Elementary Education, State Department of Education

WILLIAM DWYER, Immediate Past President
Superintendent, Jemez Springs Public Schools

WILLIAM HALL
Superintendent, Corona Public Schools

MACK HENINGTON
Superintendent, Estancia Public Schools

CANUTO MELENDEZ
Superintendent, Pecos Public Schools

PETE SANTISTEVAN
Superintendent, Bernalillo Public Schools

JAMES STEINEPREIS
Superintendent, Quemado Independent Schools

NOAH TURPEN
Associate Superintendent, Albuquerque Public Schools

FOREWORD

This study was made by Dr. John Seaberg and Dr. Horacio Ulibarri.

John Seaberg served as a principal of the Center, Colorado High School for several years, then took his Doctorate in Educational Administration from the University of New Mexico. He also served as Field Director on the Community Action Project for Barelas, in Bernalillo County, New Mexico.

Dr. Ulibarri is a member of the faculty of the Educational Administration Department, College of Education, at the University of New Mexico. He has a wealth of experience and training in the area of sociological problems. He is particularly interested in the delicate balance where staff relationships are concerned.

This study should be of tremendous interest to school boards, school administrators, and teacher groups as they analyze their own positions in the complex spectrum of the educational establishment.

TOM WILEY

I. INTRODUCTION

The intensified demand by organized teachers to participate in the formulation of policies that affect them, to bargain or negotiate collectively concerning salaries and other conditions of employment, are among the most salient problems confronting the educational enterprise. The present militancy and collective activity of teacher organizations can be viewed as a revolt against the traditional bureaucratic pattern of school organization. One means of dealing with authority and unilateral control is through bargaining and its institutionalized form—collective negotiations.[1]

The diffuseness of militant teacher organization goals and the collective actions which they have chosen to achieve these goals represent tactical advantages for teacher organizations in their confrontation with the traditional authority structure of the school. Local boards of education and administrators appear confused concerning what teachers really want and seem even more confused by the power play which the militant teacher organizations have initiated.[2]

Historical Factors Affecting Teacher Militancy

In order to help discern the present conflict, a sequence in the development of educational administration and the establishment of cohesive teacher groups is presented.

Historical Development of Educational Administration

Job analysis espoused by Taylor in the early 1900's was the first approach to administration. A human relations era, 1930 to approximately 1950, followed and currently administration is in the behavioral science period advocated initilaly by Bernard and Simon.

One of the first to apply Taylor's scientific management principles to school administration was Frank Spaulding. His conception of scientific management amounted to an analysis of the budget and his scientific determination of *educational value* turned out to be determination of *dollar value.* Spaulding's decisions on what should be taught were *not on educational but on financial grounds.* Bobbitt went beyond merely suggesting that the business and industrial world enter the schools and set up standards; he made it their civic duty. Cubberly helped to ensure that the thousands of students who used his texts would be exposed, at least indirectly, to the pressure to adopt "scientific efficiency" procedures in education. Strayer, during his years of association with the graduate program in educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia, directed the program toward the technical, financial, and mechanical problems of education.[3]

According to Calahan, schoolmen were responding to criticism and the critics during this period. The critics wanted to reduce, or at least prevent an increase in school taxes and they wanted to be assured that their schools were

being operated efficiently, i.e. that they were getting maximum return for their expenditure. Administrators either studied the advice of the "experts" and applied efficiency procedures themselves or if the situation was critical they called in the efficiency expert to help them save their jobs.[4]

Teacher participation in decision-making and policy development has resulted traditionally from the board of education's voluntary cooperation with the teachers involved. However, since boards of education have had the legal right to control their relationships with teachers it cannot be said that these relationships were completely bilateral. The conventional wisdom of educational administration rests on a rigid system of superordination and subordination. Thompson points out that under the monistic conception "it is assumed that the superior, at any point in the hierarchy, is *able* to tell his subordinates what to do, and to guide them in doing it. That is, it is assumed that he is more capable in all of his unit's activities than any of his subordinate specialists who perform them."[5] This organizational stereotype and the supporting ideology form the basis of much of today's practice in school administration.

The NEA and AFT

To combat the theories of scientific management, teachers have formed two national educational organizations—the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers.

Objectives of the National Education Association, according to their handbook are:

> The NEA is an independent, voluntary, nongovernmental organization available to all professional teachers. It believes that all educators, regardless of position, rank, or authority, are workers in a common cause. It cooperates with all groups in American life who seek to improve education. It works for better schools, and to further that end, for the improvement of the professional status of teachers. Under such policies, the National Education Association has become the largest professional organization in the world and the only overall professional association for teachers in the United States.[6]

The stated objectives of the American Federation of Teachers, affiliated with the AFL-CIO, are as follows:

1. To bring associations of teachers into relations of mutual assistance and cooperation.
2. To obtain for them all the rights to which they are entitled.
3. To raise the standards of the teaching profession by securing the conditions essential to the best professional service.
4. To promote such a democratization of the schools as will enable them better to equip their pupils to take their places in the industrial, social, and political life of the community.
5. To promote the welfare of the childhood of the nation by providing progressively better educational opportunity for all.[7]

The AFT and NEA possess varying philosophic orientations concerning whether administrative personnel should be included in or excluded from the local teacher negotiating unit. The AFT accepts as given the existence of significant conflict in the schools and declares the need of teachers for power

to wield in that conflict. Exclusion of administrative personnel from classroom teacher organizations and the bargaining units is preferred. This position is based on what may be termed the private industry or conflict-of-interest model of supervisor-supervised relationships. The NEA is not certain about the inevitable conflict in the schools and is instinctively wary of collective bargaining as a suitable method of structuring the administration-teachers relationship within a school system. The AFT displays strong antipathy to programs in professional ethics due largely to AFT identification of such programs with the association. Similarly, the NEA has been hostile to "labor tactics," even where such tactics are clearly appropriate in an educational situation.[8]

It should be noted that collective bargaining versus professional negotiations is not a real issue. Negotiation is considered to be a practicular form or part of the more basic bargaining process. Before negotiating, one must be in a position to bargain.[9]

Conflict in the Educational Enterprise

Conflict may be said to be endemic to organizations in pursuit of goals. It is a function of the limitations of individuals and groups to agree on goals, to communicate, to change, and to behave rationally.[10]

Theory and Practice in School Administration as Conflict Factors

During the behavioral science era school administrators have become increasingly aware of the role of theory and have come to recognize the contributions that social scientists can make to the understanding of educational administration. Evidence of this trend is discernable by noting the establishment, in 1947, of the National Council for Professors of Educational Administration, the Cooperative Program in Education, begun in 1950, and the University Council for Educational Administration which was established in 1956.

The behavioral science analysis to educational administration views the specific function of administration as developing and regulating the decision-making process in the most effective manner possible.[11] In practically any discussion of the process of decision-making, steps similar to the following are presented and described:

1. Recognize, define, and limit the problem.
2. Analyze and evaluate the problem.
3. Establish criteria or standards by which a solution will be evaluated or judged as acceptable and adequate to the need.
4. Collect data.
5. Formulate and select the preferred solution or solutions.
6. Put into effect the preferred solution.
   a. Program the solution.
   b. Control the activities in the program.
   c. Evaluate the results of the process.[12]

The preparation for making a particular decision begins in the past of the decision-maker, before the first formal step in the process. In the first step

the problem becomes known, and the decision-maker goes through a process of defining and limiting the problem. He attempts to state the problem in terms of either his goals or the goals of the enterprise, and he also attempts to state the problem in such a way that he can grasp its significance.[13]

With regard to goal attainment in schools, the classical philosophy is the participation of the professional staff and board in policy *development*, the *enactment* of policy by the board, and *execution* of policy by the board's executive and professional staff. Conventionally it has been the prerogative of the board to make final decisions in the event of impasse.

In theory, educational administration has advanced to the behavioral science stage. In practice, however, many school districts continue to operate under the principles of Taylor's scientific management and the conventional wisdom of school administration.

Increased Teacher Preparation and Expertise as a Conflict Factor

Today's teachers bring to their work increased levels of preparation and expertise. They express concern about the wisdom of administrators in the exercise of administrative authority. Teachers, in general, express their restiveness about the competence of administrators to exercise supervisory authority. Their aspirations on this score center on restricting the rights of and opportunities for administrators to evaluate teaching performance and to make decisions on teacher assignments which are related to qualitative assessment. These aspirations are typically complemented by searching behavior designed to expand the base of collegial participation in decisions on educational policies and procedures. Teachers also share aspirations for relief from non-instructional chores, ranging from yard and lunch duty to clerical work, and for establishing equitable bases to determine load and assignments.[14]

As consideration for their advanced levels of professional preparation, teachers want greater rewards for their services. They want the higher social status and prestige which come with higher salary. They wish to protect their group from outside attack, to which the educational establishment has been submitted, and they desire to protect their rights to seek the most favorable conditions of work.

Increased Militancy of Teacher Organizations

Organized teacher groups are displaying increased dissatisfaction with the traditional cooperative decision-making techniques employed by administrators and school boards. They are forcefully requesting or even demanding the right to play a stronger role in organizational decisions and the formulation of local educational policy.

Currently, teacher organizations seek to establish participation in organizational decision-making as a right, supported in law, as distinct from a permissive opportunity extended by school boards and administrators. Even more significant is that teacher organizations seek to establish provision for third-party involvement when their elected representatives and the legally constituted officials of the organization reach an impasse. This drive, upon

the part of militant teacher organizations, goes beyond the boundaries of education as a professional endeavor. It contains employment conditions which are not unique to education.

In attempting to analyze current teacher militancy, Wildman contends that one can view the phenomenon as an historical accident or the result of a conjunction of a number of factors which are at one and the same time both cause and effect. He suggests that pressures developing as a result of the problems of the large city system—more of the hard-to-teach, insufficient tax funds for facilities and salaries—are examples. Also, the big city teacher is closely surrounded by highly organized and powerful groups in the midst of which he may feel relatively powerless unless he, too, is organized. A primary effect of the organization and bargaining in New York, and similar developments in other large cities was to pose the AFT as a threat to that hitherto dormant giant, the NEA and its state affiliates. The NEA, a relatively wealthy organization, is now providing guidance and leadership to smaller but highly organized and effective state organizations in making available and promoting a program of power consolidation, negotiation, and shared control at the local level. The NEA response to the union challenge appears to have become an independent causal factor of great potential significance which will stimulate further collective action among public school teachers.[15]

Threat of Teacher Militancy to School Board and Superintendent

School boards and administrators view the growing militancy of teacher organizations as a threat to their authority. Much of the writing on board-superintendent relationships suggests that the differentiation of function between the board and superintendent is a very simple one: the board to formulate policy, the superintendent to administr it. This formulation has a certain gross usefulness, but upon examination it becomes apparent that most superintendents influence policy and that most boards take some hand in administration.[16] Houle has suggested that the board and the superintendent are partners in the management of the enterprise, each with distinctive contributions to make.[17]

The concepts and procedures of collective negotiation have, as their underlying purpose, an accommodation of group conflict within an organization. In the school context, the formalized conflict has led to collective negotiations—administration versus teachers.

Generally, miliant teacher organizations prefer to negotiate directly with boards of education, to by-pass the administrative hierarchy. The reason is simple enough. Represenatives of teacher organizations desire to negotiate with representative of boards who possess the authority to make agreements. The determination of teachers to reach the board directly may, in turn, drive the administrative hierarchy into a more clearly defined "managerial" and executive arrangement. Teachers' unions seem to care little about such a consequence. Professional associations, on the other hand, reveal greater ambivalence on this score.

The important consideration is not that unilateral control will be diminished with collective negotiations, but is rather who, at what level of authority

within the organization, will have the crucial function of managing and adapting the organization to the new relationships which collective negotiating brings.[18]

Several conclusions can be discerned from the literature. One of them is that with the advent of collective negotiation the role of the chief administrator may become truly that of a "middle man," interpreting the teachers to the board and the board to the teachers, providing information, council, and mediating services to both during the negotiating process. Another is that school boards and superintendents view this suggested role as a concession to militant teacher groups. Also, the board and superintendent seem further threatened by permitting representatives of a local teacher organization to negotiate directly with the board. By such a concession, the traditional partnership of the educational enterprise relinguishes unilateral control over policy formulation and organizational decision-making.

The Problem

The expansion of militant practices by organized teacher groups is one of the most salient issues confronting the educational enterprise. Local boards of education and administrators seem confused regarding what teachers really want and the methods employed by teacher organizations to obtain a greater voice in policy formulation and decision-making.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the conflict, within the educational enterprise, beween administration and teacher organizations in policy formulation and decision-making in New Mexico.

More specifically, this investigation sought answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a difference between the school administration and teachers concerning the areas of importance in policy formulation and decision-making?
2. Is there a difference between the school administration and teachers concerning the areas in which teachers should be involved in policy formulation and decision-making?
3. Is there a difference between the school administration and teachers concerning the methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals?

Delimitation of the Study

This study was limited to analyzing the nature of the school administration-teacher organizations conflict in New Mexico school districts having both NEA and AFT affiliates. It was further limited to selected areas of policy formulation. By investigating New Mexico only, comparable samples were obtained and such variables as labor unions in large cities, local monies available for education, superintendent and teacher certification, and degree of cohesiveness of teachers' organizations were relatively constant.

Importance of the Study

Although teacher militancy has not reached the proportions in New

Mexico that are observable in some states, it is developing and will probably accelerate. Hopefully, this study will help to improve communication between school administration and organized teacher groups concerning what is negotiable, the degree of importance of negotiable items, and satisfactory negotiation procedures. Much of the writing on the subject has been speculative and this study presents empirical evidence regarding these areas.

Definition of Terms

1. *Local school administration*—local school administration is interpreted to mean the upper echelon of the local school administration (superintendent, assistant superintendents and business manager) and elected school board members of a school district.
2. *Decision-making process*—decision-making process is interpreted as meaning not only the decision but also the acts necessary to put the decision into operation and so actually affect the course of action of an enterprise.
3. *Collective negotiations*—collective negotiations is interpreted as meaning a process whereby a representative or representatives of the employees and their employer jointly determine their conditions of employment. Collective negotiations will mean "collective negotiations in education" unless a different meaning is obvious from the context.

1. Robert E. Ohm, "Collective Negotiations: Implications for Research," *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration*. Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967), p. 112.
2. Norman J. Boyan, "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and the Authority Structure of the School," *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration*. Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967), p. 10.
3. Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 73-188.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
5. Victor A. Thompson, *Modern Organization* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1963), p. 75.
6. National Education Association, *NEA Handbook* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966), p. 15.
7. *Constitution of the American Federation of Teachers* (Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, October, 1967), p. 3.
8. Myron Liberman and Michael H. Moskow, *Collective Negotiations for Teachers* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966), p. 402.
9. Ohm, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
11. Daniel E. Griffiths, *Administrative Theory* (Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1959), p. 73.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
13. Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative as Decision-Making," *Administrative Theory in Education*. Andrew W. Halpin (ed.) (Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center, Univ. of Chicago, 1958), p. 129.
14. Boyan, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
15. Wesley A. Wildman, "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. XLVI, No. 4 (Dec., 1964), p. 154.
16. Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Rodercik F. McPhee, *The Organization and Control of American Schools* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965), p. 209.
17. Cyril O. Houle, "The Functions of Governing Boards in the Administration of Large Enterprises," *Excellence in Administration: The Dynamics of Leadership* (Stanford, Calif.: School of Education, Stanford University, 1962), Chapter iii.
18. Wildman, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

II. PROCEDURES

A critical review of related literature revealed much of the information available concerning teacher militancy to be conjecture—little has been done in gathering empirical evidence to support stated opinions. Even more evident was the lack of information to help solve one of the most outstanding issues confronting the local educational enterprise—what is negotiable between teachers and their employers?

Sample

It was assumed that greater conflict existed in New Mexico school districts having both NEA and AFT affiliates. Therefore, the American Federation of Teachers Organization was used as the reference group for this investigation. The total number of AFT affiliates consisted of locals in six public school districts. Since these districts also had NEA affiliates, it was decided that these districts would represent the total study sample. In selecting a teacher organizations sample, the decision was to use local NEA and AFT affiliate officers and ex-officers in each of the sample districts. It was assumed that these individuals had internalized the values of their organizations and would respond accordingly. In the same districts, the upper echelon of the local school administratoin (superintendent, assistant superintendent, and business manager) plus members of the local board of education were selected as the administrative sample.

Data Collection

To collect data which would answer the study's questions, a three part questionnaire composed of Likert-type scales was developed. Part One, composed of 44 items, used a four point scale ranging from *little* or *no importance* to *very important* to determine the subject's concept of the importance of the areas of school district policy formulation. Part Two, composed of the same 44 items, utilized a four point scale from *never* to *always* to determine the respondent's concept of the degree to which teachers should be involved in decision-making. In Part Three the methods teachers should employ to obtain the goal of being involved in that particular decision were investigated. The choices were: (1) None, (2) Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, (3) Professional Negotiations Only, (4) Collective Bargaining Only, (5) Sanctions When Professional Negotiations Have Failed, and (6) Strikes When Collective Bargaining Has Failed.

III. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this section is to present a statistical analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire.

Analysis of the Data

Computations were made from a 62 per cent questionnaire return. Re-

turns by group were as follows: Administration, 21 of 43–49 per cent; NEA affiliate officers, 36 of 57–63 per cent; and AFT affiliate officers, 33 of 45–73 per cent. The three sets of supporting data analysis tables and the questionnaire developed for data collection are on file with the library at the University of New Mexico.[1]

For Part One items having an F ratio indicating a significant difference among the three groups, Table 1 presents an analysis showing between which groups a significant difference occurred. Table 2 presents the same analysis for Part Two of the questionnaire and also gives the three group coefficient of concordance factors for the same items of Part Three. Table 3 presents F ratios comparing each group's Part One responses with their responses for the same item of Part Two of the questionnaire.[2]

Analysis of Individual Items—Part One of the Questionnaire

The following section presents an interpretation of the data as obtained from Table 1. Only those items differing significantly at the .01 or .05 levels of confidence are reported in this discussion.

Item One

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine teacher work load?

In this item both NEA and AFT affiliate officers believed that it was necessary to have policies to determine teachers work load. The Administration group did not think it was necessary to have a written policy on this issue.

Item Five

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine the school calendar?

Both groups of teachers believed it was more important to have policies to determine the school calendar than did Administration.

Item Twelve

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine in-service procedures?

Significant differences were noted between Administration and both affiliation officer groups. The means show that teachers believed it was more important to have policies to determine in-service procedures than did Administration.

Item Thirteen

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to select instructional materials?

Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .01 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level. According to their responses, teachers believed this policy to be more important than did Administration.

Item Fourteen

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to evaluate existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and both affiliate officer groups at the .01 level. The means show that teachers believed it was more important to have policies regarding Item Fourteen than did Administration.

Item Seventeen

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine participation in public relation activities?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .05 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Teachers believed this policy to be more important than did Administration.

Item Twenty-Four

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to plan the budget?

A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. No significant differences were noted between NEA affiliates and Administration. AFT [illegible]ate officers believed this policy to be more important than did NEA affiliate officers and Administration.

Item Twenty-Six

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine the size of the administrative staff?

Significant differences were noted between AFT and NEA affiliate officers and between AFT affiliate officers and Administration at the .05 level of confidence. AFT affiliate officers believed this policy to be more important than did NEA affiliate officers and Administration.

Item Twenty-Seven

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine extra duties for teachers?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers, and between AFT officers and and Administration at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers believed this policy to be more important than did Administration, AFT affiliate officers believed it to be of greater importance than either of the other two groups.

Item Twenty-Nine

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine compensation for extra duties?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between AFT affiliate officers and Administration. AFT affiliate officers considered this policy to be of greater importance than did Administration.

Item Thirty-Seven

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine the kind and size of summer program?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Officers of the AFT affiliates considered this policy to be of greater importance than did NEA affiliate officers and Administration.

Item Forty-One

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine length, content and number of instructional staff meetings?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and both affiliate officer groups at the .01 level. The means show that teachers considered this policy to be of greater importance than did Administration.

Item Forty-Three

> With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies to determine the auxliary services offered by the school?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Officers of AFT affiliates considered this policy to be of greater importance than did Administration.

Compilation for Part One of the Questionnaire

Thirteen (13) items indicated a significant difference among the three groups.

Thirty-one (31) items indicated no significant difference among the three groups.

Analysis of Individual Items—Part Two and Three of the Questionnaire

This section presents an interpretation of the data as obtained from Table 2. The data include (1) the degree to which teachers should be involved in the decision-making process regarding certain issues and (2) the method that teachers should use to obtain this end. Only the items showing significant differences at the .01 and .05 levels of significance are treated in this discussion.

Item One

> With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining teacher work load?

Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affili-

ate officers at the .05 level, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in this decision to a greater extent than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings indicated relatively high agreement among the three groups regarding the method (collective negotiations) teachers should use to be involved in this decision.

Item Two

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining qualifications for applicants for instructional staff positions?

Significant differences were noted between NEA affiliate officers and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the same level. Administration and NEA affiliate officers were in agreement that teachers should be involved minimally in these decisions whereas AFT affiliate officers desired teacher participation *usually* or *always*.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The results indicated relatively high agreement among the three groups regarding the method (collective negotiations) teachers should use to become involved in this decision.

Item Three

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions (other than that of superintendent)?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers, between AFT and NEA affiliate officers, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers preferred greater teacher involvement in this decision than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers desired greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in this decision. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—None, AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Seven

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be invloved in determining the basis and levels of the salary schedule?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT officers at the .01 level. Although Administration and NEA affiliate officers were in agreement that teachers should *usually* be involved in these decisions, AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher involvement at the *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was high agreement among the three groups concerning the method (collective negotiations) that teachers should use to become involved in these decisions.

Item Eleven

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining qualifications for applicants for the position of superintendent?

Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .05 level; between NEA affiliate officers and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level; and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in these decisions to a greater extent than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in the decision. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—None, AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Fifteen

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining sick leave practices?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers. NEA affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation in these decisions than did the Administration or AFT affiliate officers.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings suggest little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in this decision. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts and NEA and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Sixteen

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining terms of contracts?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between NEA affiliate officers and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should *usually* be involved in these decisions, AFT affiliate officers desired teacher participation at the *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings suggest little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in this decision. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and NEA and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Seventeen

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining participation in public relation activities?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level. Administration and NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should *usually* be involved in these decisions whereas AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher involvement at the *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was high agreement among the three groups regarding the method (informal teacher-administrator contacts) teachers should use to be involved in this decision.

Item Twenty

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the procedures for supervision of the instructional staff?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .05 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers preferred greater involvement in these decisions than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers desired greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The low significance of the findings indicated that some members of the groups did not agree on the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Twenty-Three

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be

involved in determining the promotion and retention of instructional personnel?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .01 level; between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level; and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in these decisions to a greater extent than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The members of the groups did not agree on the method teachers should use to be involved in this decision. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Twenty-Four

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in planning the budget?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between NEA affiliate officers and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the same level. Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should *usually* be involved in these decisions; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher participation approaching the *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings indicated considerable agreement among the three groups regarding the method (collective negotiations) teachers should use to become involved in these decisions.

Item Twenty-Five

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in selecting and recommending instructional personnel?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences, at the .01 level, were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in this decision to a greater extent than did the Administration; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings showed little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration and NEA affiliate officers—Informal

Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Twenty-Six

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the size of the administrative staff?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences, at the .01 level, were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Although NEA affiliate officers desired greater teacher participation in these decisions than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher involvement than either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to become involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—None, NEA affiliate officers—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Twenty-Seven

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining extra duties for teachers?

Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .01 level, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in these decisions to a greater extent than did the Administration; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

No agreement was reached on the method that teachers should use to become involved in the decision-making process regarding this issue. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Twenty-Eight

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the responsibilities of the administrative staff?

Significant differences, at the .01 level, were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Although NEA affiliate officers desired greater teacher participation in these decisions than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher involvement than either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Little agreement was noted among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—None, NEA affiliate officers—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Twenty-Nine

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining compensation for extra duties?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .05 level, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in these decisions to a greater extent than did the Administration; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was disagreement noted regarding this item. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Thirty-One

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in planning the building program?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should be involved *occasionally* to *usually* in these decisions while AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher participation at the *usually* to *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was very little agreement as to the means that teachers should use to obtain this goal. Rankings regarding method were: Administration and NEA affiliate officers—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Thirty-Two

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining building maintenance practices?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .05 level and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should *occasionally* be involved in these decisions; however, AFT affiliate officers desired teacher participation at the *usually* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Considerable agreement was noted among the three groups regarding the method (informal teacher-administrator contacts) teachers should use to be involved in these decisions.

Item Thirty-Three

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining district pay procedures?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference, at the .01 level, was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should *usually* be involved in these decisions whereas AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher participation near the *always* position.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was relatively high agreement among the three groups concerning the method (collective negotiations) teachers should use to become involved in these decisions.

Item Thirty-Four

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in setting standards for substitute teachers?

Statistical Interpretation. The findings indicated a signigficant difference among the three groups at the .05 level of confidence. Significant differences, at the .05 level, were noted between both teacher groups and Administration.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

There was an indication of a relatively high agreement among the three groups regarding the method (collective negotiations) teachers should use to be involved in these decisions.

Item Thirty-Five

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in assigning teachers?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .05 level, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Although NEA affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in this decision to greater an extent than did the Administration, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher participation than did either of the other two groups.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Minimal agreement regarding the method to be used to obtain this goal was found in the responses to Item Thirty-Five. Rankings regarding method

were: Administration–Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and NEA and AFT affiliate officers–Collective Negotiations.

Item Thirty-Six

> With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in selecting and recommending administrative personnel?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and NEA affiliate officers at the .05 level, between NEA and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level, and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. In the opinion of Administration, teachers should be involved *never* to *occasionally;* NEA affiliate officers were of the opinion that teachers should be involved *occasionally;* and AFT affiliate officers believed that teachers should participate *usually* to *always* in these decisions.

> What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Little agreement was noted among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration–None, NEA affiliate officers–Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT affiliate officers–Collective Negotiations.

Item Thirty-Seven

> With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the kind and size of summer program?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level.

> What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings indicated considerable agreement among the three groups regarding the method (informal teacher-administrator contacts) teachers should use to be involved in these decisions.

Item Thirty-Eight

> With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining resignation procedures?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers at the .01 level. Administration favored teacher involvement *occasionally* while AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher participation *usually* to *always* in these decisions.

> What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Responses to Item Thirty-Eight indicated minimal agreement as to the method that should be used. Rankings regarding method were: Administration–Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and NEA and AFT affiliate officers–Collective Negotiations.

Item Thirty-Nine

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the kind of instructional program?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between the Administration and both teacher groups at the .05 level. Administration favored teacher involvement in these decisions *usually* and the teachers' officers preferred teacher participation near the *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Again, little agreement was found as to method to be employed. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT and NEA affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Forty

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining professional leave practices?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between the Administration and both teacher groups at the .01 level. Administration believed teachers should *usually* be involved in these decisions; however, the teachers' officers preferred teacher participation near the *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings suggest relatively high agreement among the three groups regarding the method (collective negotiations) teachers should use to become involved in these decisions.

Item Forty-One

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining length, content, and number of instructional staff meetings?

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference, at the .01 level, was noted between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. It was the opinion of the Administration that teachers should be involved in these decisions *occasionally* to *usually* while AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher participation at the *usually* or *always* level.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The results suggest relatively high agreement among the three groups regarding the method (informal teacher-administrator contacts) teachers should use to become involved in these decisions.

Item Forty-Two

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the promotion and retention of administrative personnel (other than superintendent)?

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted between Administration and both teacher groups at the .01 level. Administration believed teachers should be involved *never* or *occasionally* in these decisions; however, the teachers' officers favored teacher participation *usually* or *always.*

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings indicated little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration—None, and NEA and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Item Forty-Three

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining the auxiliary services offered by the school?

Statistical Interpretation. The findings indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the .01 level of confidence. Significant differences, at the .01 level, were noted between NEA and AFT affiliate officers and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should be involved *occasionally* or *usually,* while AFT affiliate officers favored teacher participation *usually* or *always* in these decisions.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

The findings suggest a high level of agreement among the three groups regarding the method (informal teacher-administrator contacts) teachers should use to become involved in these decisions.

Item Forty-Four

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved in determining financial needs and expenditure plans (other than salaries)?

Significant differences, at the .01 level, were noted between NEA and AFT affiliate officers and between Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed that teachers should be involved *occasionally* or *usually;* however, AFT affiliate officers favored teacher participation *usually* or *always* in these decisions.

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal?

Findings indicated little agreement among the three groups regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Rankings regarding method were: Administration and NEA affiliate officers—Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, and AFT affiliate officers—Collective Negotiations.

Summary of Part Two

Thirty (30) items indicated a significant difference among the three groups. Fourteen (14) items indicated no significant difference among the groups.

Summary of Part Three

Twenty-three (23) items indicated significant agreement among the three groups.

Twenty-one (21) items indicated significant disagreement among the groups.

Comparison of Parts One and Two of the Questionnaire

This section presents an interpretation of the data as obtained from Table 3. The purpose of this statistical analysis was to discern whether or not there was a significant diffrence between a group's responses regarding the importance of a district policy and the degree to which teachers should be involved in these decisions. Responses indicated a significant difference for the following questionnaire items.

Item Two

Qualifications for applicants for instructional staff positions.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups believed the policies to be very important; however, in their opinion teachers should be involved only occasionally or usually in these decisions. AFT officers' responses pointed out high importance and teacher involvement.

Item Three

Qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were indicated in the responses of all three groups. Although all agreed that policies for this purpose were very important, they believed teachers should be involved as follows: Administration, occasionally; NEA affiliate officers, occasionally; and AFT officers, usually.

Item Four

Practices of pupil control.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of AFT affiliate officers. All three groups agreed that policies for this purpose were important; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher involvement in a higher level than did either of the other two groups.

Item Five

School Calendar.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both were of the opinion that policies for this purpose were not too important; however, in their opinion teachers should usually be involved in these decisions.

Item Nine

District insurance programs for teachers.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the re-

sponses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both were of the opinion that policies for this purpose were not too important; however, they felt teachers should always be involved in these decisions. AFT officers' responses pointed out high importance and teacher involvement.

Item Ten

Orientation procedures for the instructional staff.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Both were of the opinion that policies for this purpose were not too important; however, both groups agreed that teachers should always be involved in these decisions.

Item Eleven

Qualifications for applicants for the position of superintendent.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups believed the policy to be important; however, in their opinion teachers should be involved only occasionally in these decisions.

Item Twelve

In-service procedures.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of Administration. In the opinion of this group, policies for this purpose were not too important but teachers should be involved in these decisions to a high degree.

Item Thirteen

Selection of instructional materials.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and AFT affiliate officers. Both indicated that policies for this purpose were not too important; however, both preferred teacher involvement at a high degree.

Item Sixteen

Terms of contracts.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups believed the policy to be very important; however, in their opinion teachers should be involved only usually in these decisions. AFT officers' responses indicated high importance and teacher involvement.

Item Eighteen

Student graduation requirements.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of Administration. In the opinion of this group policies for this purpose were important but teachers should be involved in the decisions at a degree below that of the policy's importance.

Item Nineteen

Standards for Student dress and Conduct.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of Administration. In the opinion of this group, policies for this purpose were not too important; however, they felt teachers should usually be involved in these decisions.

Item Twenty-Two

Grade reporting practices.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of AFT affiliate officers. All three groups agreed that policies for this purpose were important; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher involvement to a greater degree than did either of the other two groups.

Item Twenty-Three

Promotion and retention of instructional personnel.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was indicated in the responses of Administration. This group believed that policies for this purpose were important but teachers should be involved in these decisions only occasionally. Both teacher groups favored participation of teachers in these decisions to a greater degree than did Administration.

Item Twenty-Five

Selection and recommendation of instructional presonnel.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Although both groups believed the policy to be important, they favored teacher involvement in these decisions only occasionally or usually. AFT officers' responses pointed out high importance and teacher involvement.

Item Twenty-Six

Size of the administrative staff.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups believed this policy to be important; however, they favored teacher participation in these decisions never or occasionally. AFT responses indicated high importance and teacher involvement regarding this policy.

Item Twenty-Eight

Responsibilities of the administrative staff.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups agreed that the policy was important; however, Administration favored teacher involvement in these decisions never or occasionally while NEA affiliate officers desired teacher participation only occasionally. AFT affiliate officers were in agreement regarding policy importance but preferred teacher involvement usually or always.

Item Thirty

Non professional outside employment practices for teachers.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of AFT affiliate officers. All three groups agreed that policies for this purpose were important; however, AFT affiliate officers preferred teacher involvement in these decisions to a greater degree than did either of the other two groups.

Item Thirty-Five

Assignment of teachers.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups agreed that the policy was important; however, Administration favored teacher involvement in these decisions never or occasionally while NEA affiliate officers desired teacher participation occasionally or usually. AFT affiliate officers were in agreement regarding policy importance but preferred teacher involvement usually or always.

Item Thirty-Six

Selection and recommendation of administrative personnel.

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups agreed that the policies were important; however, Administration favored teacher involvement in these decisions never or occasionally while NEA affiliate officers desired teacher participation only occasionally. AFT affiliate officers were in agreement regarding policy importance but preferred teacher involvement usually or always.

Item Forty

Professional leave practices.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was noted in the responses of Administration. All three groups agreed that policies for this purpose were important; however, AFT and NEA affiliate officers favored teacher involvement to a greater degree than did Administration.

Item Forty-One

Length, content, and number of instructional staff meetings.

Statistical Interpretation. A significant difference was indicated in the responses of Administration. This group believed that policies for this purpose were not too important; however, they believed teachers should usually be involved in these decisions.

Item Forty-Two

Promotion and retention of administrative personnel (other than superintendent).

Statistical Interpretation. Significant differences were noted in the responses of Administration and NEA affiliate officers. Both groups agreed that the policy was important; however, Administration favored teacher involve-

ment in these decisions never or occasionally while NEA affiliate officers desired teacher participation only occasionally. AFT affiliate officers were in agreement regarding policy importance but preferred teacher involvement usually or always.

Compilation for Comparison of Questionnaire Parts One and Two

Responses indicated that Administration had significant differences for 21 of the items, NEA affiliate officers for 12 of the items, and AFT affiliate officers for 8 of the items.

1. John J. Seaberg, Jr. "Analysis of the Conflict Between School Administration and NEA and AFT affiliates in New Mexico" (Unpublished Ed. D. disseratation, College of Education, University of New Mexico, 1967).
2. *Ibid.*, 115-174.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

An attempt has been made in this chapter to interpret the findings in terms of their implications for the educational enterprise. Implications are made in relation to the extent of the study's sample; therefore, inferences are probably applicable to areas of the United States which are not heavily industrialized and not proximate to strongly unionized organizations. In some instances selected sources from the literature were utilized to point out these implications. The questionnaire's five broad areas of school district policy formulation were used to structure this discussion.

Collective Bargaining Versus Professional Negotiation

To help elucidate the implications for education regarding collective bargaining and professional negotiation, it should be noted that collective bargaining versus professional negotiations is not a real issue. Negotiation is considered to be a particular form or part of the more basic bargaining process. Before negotiating, one must be in a position to bargain.[1] This attitude was amplified by Hipp who stated, "In my book any work stoppage, legal or illegal, is a strike. A strike is a sanction and an extreme sanction is a strike."[2] It seemed that both teacher groups play organizational semantics—pretend to have opposite views, but make similar statements and undertake similar activities.

There are many similarities between an NEA Level III[3] professional negotiation agreement and an AFT collective bargaining agreement. Both establish provision for exclusive recognition, private meetings between the local association and administration, and procedures to be followed in the event of impasse.[4] In addition both groups list as negotiable similar items.[5] Salient areas of disagreement between the two organizations are inclusion of administrators in their membership and the regulatory agency used in the event of impasse. The AFT excludes administrative personnel from membership whereas the NEA favors inclusions of administrators in their local unit. To resolve disagreements between administration and teachers, the

NEA prefers that the regulating agency be an "educational channel" while the AFT supports regulation by state labor relations agencies.[6]

Implications

According to the findings of the study there is little disagreement in many instances between the two teacher organizations regarding the importance of an issue, the degree of teacher participation in the decision, and the method which should be used to accomplish teacher involvement. Why, then, cannot these organizations join forces to accomplish common goals—especially if the coalition results in a better educational enterprise?

The NEA might do well to cease the pretense of educational perpetuation and admit that it is a militant teacher organization whose basic interest is teacher welfare.

Instruction and Curriculum

Responses to items 8, 13, 37, 39, and 43 indicated general agreement between the teacher groups concerning the importance of policy, degree of teacher involvement, and the method teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives should use to be involved in these decisions. Minimal conflict was pointed out between administration and the NEA and AFT affiliate officers regarding the same areas.

Implications

Such a finding is in agreement with Wildman who suggests that an aspect of the school employment relationship which has little or no useful analogy in blue collar collective bargaining is that related to the professional aspects of teaching such as the consideration of curriculum and methodology.[7] The method preferred for teacher involvement was either informal teacher-administrator contacts or collective negotiations.

Pupil Personnel

Responses to items 4, 18, 19, and 22 indicated general agreement among the three groups concerning importance of policy, degree of teacher involvement, and the method teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives should use to be involved in these decisions. The method preferred by all three groups for teacher involvement in these policies was informal teacher-administrator contacts.

Implications

Policies related to pupil personnel are determined by informal administrator-teacher contacts and are not entered in collective negotiation agreements.

Teachers and Administration seemed interested, primarily, in their own welfare and were content to resolve pupil personnel issues on an informal basis. Insofar as students accept the school regulations and programs, they are rewarded. If they desire innovation of services or unestablished considerations, they are viewed as trouble makers.

Pupil personnel, per se, is not a major issue of the NEA.[8] Although pupil personnel is an issue of the AFT,[9] it apparently is not assigned the import-

ance of teacher welfare. This attitude is untenable if the basic function of schools is considered to be preparing students to become contributing members of the social system. Such an attitude becomes even more alarming when minority groups are considered.

As pointed out by Ulibarri, teachers fail to discern most of the socio-cultural differences that impinge on the education of the children from varying ethnic groups. Many teachers do not understand the concepts of socio-cultural considerations for the education of minority children or are unable to analyze the situations in terms of the concepts.[10] Study responses indicated the same may be said of Administration.

Student personnel policies must be incorporated into collective negotiation agreements to help insure that all students receive the educational preparation which will enable them to develop their unique abilities and become contributing societal members.

Professional Staff Personnel—Teachers

In order to make a more meaningful presentation, this policy area was divided into two sections—teachers and administration. The discussion concerning teachers consisted primarily of items 2, 6, 20, 23, 25, and 35 for which the statistical analysis is reported in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

There was general agreement among the three groups regarding the importance of these policies. Mean responses indicated that all believed them to be near the very important (4) level.

With regard to school district policies concerning the qualification, selection, supervision, promotion, retention, and recommendation of instructional personnel, a great deal of conflict was indicated within the educational enterprise. Mean responses indicated that both teacher groups desired to participate in these decisions to a much greater degree than Administration believed they should. Generally, AFT affiliate officers preferred a greater degree of teacher participation in the decisions than did affiliate officers of the NEA. In addition, the response standard deviations for the AFT officers were smaller than those of the other two groups.

Considerable conflict was also noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in professional staff decisions. For the Most part, Administration preferred informal teacher-administrator contacts whereas NEA and AFT affiliate officers desired collective negotiation procedures.

Implications

Teachers are often criticized because they do not police their own ranks. They have traditionally preferred substitution of the principle of seniority to any system of relating rewards to qualitative assessment of performance.[11] Responses to the questionnaire pointed out that AFT and NEA affiliate officers desired a voice in qualifying, selecting, supervising, promoting, retaining, and recommending the instructional staff. Responses of Administration, on the other hand, indicated continued control of these decisions through little or no teacher participation and informal teacher-administrator contacts as the method of involvement. Teachers cannot police their own ranks if the opportunity to participate in professional staff decisions is unavailable or unattainable.

The smaller response standard deviations of the AFT affiliate officers suggest greater homogeneity and cohesiveness for this group than for NEA affiliate officers. Also, the AFT group had fewer items on which a significant difference was noted when Parts One and Two of the questionnaire were compared. F ratios indicated greater conflict between AFT affiliate officers and Administration than between NEA affiliate officers and Administration.

Concerning instructional staff decisions, active conflict between AFT affiliate officers and Administration seem to be arriving on the scene. "No hostile employee reaction will tend to be taken until cohesive groups are formed."[12] This implication is further supported by Stotland who contends that "the expression of direct, overt hostility to a threatening power figure tends to occur more frequently when individuals belong to supportive peer groups."[13]

Since teachers preferred collective negotiations and Administration favored informal teacher-administrator contacts as the methods teachers should use to become involved in professional staff decisions, implications for the preparation of school administrators and the role of the superintendent in and during negotiations were discerned.

Preparation programs for school administrators in the area of collective negotiation will not be realistic until some reasonable consensus is developed to help resolve the dilemma of the superintendent.[14] The superintendent should not be the school board's representative in bargaining sessions with teachers. He can be a consultant or advisor to the board and can work closely with the representative he assigns to deal directly with the teachers. The person appointed as the board's representative should be one of the other administrators—the personnel director, for example. The superintendent cannot be a tough labor boss during negotiations and then assume the role of instructional leader when not representing the board at the conference table.[15]

Such a situation suggests additional implications for small schools not having a large central office administrative staff. In smaller schools, either the superintendent must assume the dual role, or a representative for administration from outside the organization employed. This further suggests the need for special personnel with a behavioral science orientation to school administration and sophistication in the area of collective negotiations. Small schools may well need to form cooperatives and employ an individual possessing such a preparation to represent Administration during collective negotiation conferences.

Professional Staff Personnel—Administration

The discussion concerning Administration consisted primarily of analyzing items 3, 11, 26, 38, 36, and 42. A statistical analysis for these items is reported in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Little disagreement was noted among the groups concerning the importance of these policies.

Responses to items regarding the qualifications, size, responsibilities, selection, retention, promotion, and recommendation of the administrative staff indicated serious conflict within the educational enerprise. Mean responses

indicated that both teacher groups desired to participate in these decisions to a much greater degree than Administration believed they should. In all cases, AFT affiliate officers preferred greater teacher involvement than did affiliate officers of the NEA. It was between affiliate officers of the AFT and Administration that highly significant F ratios were noted. This indicated serious conflict, within the educational enterprise, between these two groups.

Serious conflict was also noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in decisions concerning the qualifications, selection, retention, promotion, and recommendation of the administrative staff. Administration felt teachers should not be involved in these decisions whereas NEA and AFT affiliate officers preferred collective negotiation procedures as the method of teacher participation.

Implications

Administration strongly believes that teachers should not be involved in decisions regarding the administrative staff. If teacher organizations are successful in winning local collective negotiation agreements, they could use policies related to administrative staff personnel at the bargaining table to win greater teacher participation in professional staff decisions. Teachers might then operationalize policing of their ranks by electing colleagues, whose competence is accepted by their peers, to participate in district decisions concerning the instructional staff.

Responses of the teacher groups indicated an inconsistency in their values. "Teachers in general express their restiveness about the competence of administrators to exercise supervisory authority."[16] However, their responses to items 36 and 42 indicated they felt teachers were qualified to be involved with selecting, recommending, promoting, and retaining administrative personnel.

In some cases Administration believed district policies to be very important and preferred little teacher participation, in other instances their opinions were reversed—the policies were viewed as relatively unimportant and they believed teachers should always participate. This suggests pacification of teachers with school district trivia while Administration controls the important decisions of the educational enterprise. It has been suggested that the board and the superintendent are partners in the management of the enterprise.[17] Most superintendents influence policy and most boards take some hand in administration.[18]

School Plant

The discussion concerning school plant policies was taken from responses to items 14, 31, and 32.

Although considerable agreement was noted regarding the importance of school plant policies, a conflict was discerned among the groups concerning the evaluation of existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs. Mean responses indicated that both teacher groups believed policies for this purpose to be more important than did Administration.

Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed regarding the degree to which teachers should be involved in planning the building program and

determining building maintenance practices. AFT affiliate officers, however, preferred that teachers have a greater voice in these decisions.

Considerable conflict was also noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in school plant decisions. Generally, Administration and NEA affiliate officers preferred informal teacher-administration contacts while affiliate officers of the AFT favored collective negotiation procedures.

Implications

Teachers view school plant decisions as conditions of employment and desire to teach in the best possible physical facilities. In addition it seemed that teachers tend to view the school plant in terms of curriculum whereas Administration views it in terms of physical plant—an appropriate square footage for X classrooms, Y teachers and Z students. Conflict among the groups regarding school plant decisions was another indication that greater conflict existed between AFT affiliate officers and Administration than between officers of NEA affiliates and Administration.

District Finance and Business Management

Items 7, 16, 24, 29, 30, 33, and 44 were utilized for the presentation concerning district finance and business management. A statistical analysis for these items is presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Generally, NEA affiliate officers were in agreement with Administration concerning the degree to which teachers should be involved in district finance and business management decisions. Conflict within the educational enterprise was noted between AFT affiliate officers and members of the other two groups. AFT representatives believed teachers and/or their local affiliate officers should always be involved concerning district finance procedures.

Considerable conflict was also noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in district finance decisions. In most instances Administration preferred informal teacher-administrator contacts whereas teacher affiliate officers favored collective negotiations or strikes and sanctions.

Implications

Teachers desire status in the community, a respectable standard of living, and an opportunity to shape career plans—money is essential if these desires are to be realized.

Teachers want greater economic rewards for their services. They want the higher social status and prestige which come with higher salary and the rights to seek the most favorable conditions of work.[19]

In states where the majority of the support for local schools is appropriated by the state legislature, the local school administration occupies a precarious position. Since many agencies must be supported by the state's income, education is only one of many organizations competing for state monies. In addition, the minimal local support levey is goverened by statute. Administration's dilemma is financing the on-going organization while satisfying the salary demands of the professional staff.

During legislative sessions NEA and AFT affiliate representatives and Administration present separate educational program and financial proposals. Each organization then works assiduously for approval of its proposals

and violently opposes the recommendations of the other educational groups. The legislature seizes this opportunity to astutely maneuver these factions into an intra-educational battle while they allocate funds as they please with minimal effective pressure and few constructive recommendations from educational forces.

If Administration and NEA and AFT affiliates truly desire to improve education in states which finance the major portion of local education, they must join forces to present a united coalition during appropriation sessions. In addition they must vigorously support joint proposals for increasing educational financial support and improving the educational enterprise.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The statistical treatment of the data seemed to justify the following conclusions.

> There is no significant difference among the three groups—local school administration, local NEA affiliate officers, and local AFT affiliate officers—regarding the areas of importance of policy formulation and decision-making.

Significant differences however, were noted between the groups regarding the importance of policies:

1. To determine teacher work load.
5. To determine the school calendar.
12. To determine in-service procedures.
13. To select instructional materials.
14. To evaluate existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs.
17. To determine participation in public relation activities.
24. To plan the budget.
26. To determine the size of the administrative staff.
27. To determine extra duties for teachers.
29. To determine compensation for extra duties.
37. To determine the kind and size of summer program.
41. To determine length, content, and number of instructional staff meetings.
43. To determine the auxiliary services offered by the school.

For the most part the teacher organizations were in agreement—the significant differences occurred between Administration and AFT and NEA affiliate officers.

> Significant difference were found among the three groups—local school administration, local NEA affiliate officers, and local AFT affiliate officers—regarding the areas in which teachers should be involved in policy formulation and decision-making.

However, no significant differences were noted among the groups regarding the degree to which teachers should be involved:

4. In determining practices of pupil control.

5. In determining the school calendar.
6. In determining the duties of instructional staff members.
8. In determining curriculum content.
9. In determining district insurance programs for teachers.
10. In determining orientation procedures for the instructional staff.
12. In determining in-service procedures.
13. In selecting instructional materials.
14. In evaluating existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs.
18. In determining student graduation requirements.
19. In determining standards for student dress and conduct.
21. In determining public relation activities.
22. In determining grade reporting practices.
30. In determining non professional outside employment practices for teachers.

A mixed reaction was noted in the comparison of Administration and NEA affiliate officers and NEA and AFT affiliate officers. In each case, significate differences were noted for approximately fifty per cent of the items in Part Two of the questionnaire. The strongest differences occured when comparing Administration and AFT affiliate officers. A significant difference between these two groups was noted for approximately seventy per cent of the items for Part Two.

There was a mixed reaction among the three groups—local school administration, local NEA affiliate officers, and local AFT affiliate officers—regarding the methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals.

The groups agreed and disagreed upon approximately fifty per cent of the Part Three items. There seemed to be a great deal of uncertainty within and among groups regarding the method teachers should employ to become involved in district formulation and decision-making.

Recommendations

1. The AFT and NEA affiliates should form a coalition and vigorously support local issues which would improve the educational enterprise.
2. Student personnel policies should be incorporated into collective negotiation agreements to help insure that all students receive the educational preparation which will enable them to develop their unique abilities and become contributing societal members.
3. Institutions which prepare school administrators should utilize the behavioral science approach to school administration with a portion of the seminar instruction and field experiences devoted to collective negotiations.
4. Small schools should form cooperatives and employ a person, with the preparation described in recommendation three, to represent Administration during collective negotiation conferences. It was assumed that teachers, through their NEA ad AFT affiliates, would have adequate representation.
5. Teachers should be given the opportunity to police their own ranks by electing colleagues, whose competence is accepted by their peers, to participate in qualifying, selecting, supervising, promoting, retaining, and recommending the local instructional staff.

6. In states which finance the major portion of local education, Administration and NEA and AFT affiliate officers should join forces to present a united coalition during legislative appropriation sessions and vigorously support joint proposals to increase educational financial support and improve the state's educational programs.

1. Ohm, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
2. Hipp, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
3. National Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 43-47.
5. Lieberman and Moskow, *op. cit.*, p. 341.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 389.
7. Wildman, *op. cit.*, p. 153.
8. National Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
9. Constitution of the American Federation of Teachers, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
10. Horacio Ulibarri, "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi- Cultural Classrooms" (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, College of Education, University of New Mexico), p. 118.
11. Boyan, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
12. Argyris, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
13. Stotland, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.
14. Henry E. Butler, Jr., "Legal Implications of Concerted Action of Teachers," *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (eds.) (Fayetteville: University of Argansas, 1967), p. 83.
15. Eric Rhodes, "How to Negotiate With Your Teachers—Without Surrendering," *School Management*, 10 (September, 1966), pp. 113-114.
16. Boyan, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
17. Houle, *op. cit.*, Chapter iii.
18. Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
19. Boyan, *op. cit.*, p. 9

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Argyris, Chris. *Integrating the Individual and the Organization.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

————. *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness.* Homewood, Ill.: Darsey Press, 1962.

————. "Personal vs. Organizational Goals." *Human Relations in Administration.* Robert Dubin, ed. (Second edition) Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

————. *Understanding Organizational Behavior.* Homewood: Dorsey Press, 1960.

Barnard, Chester I. *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Berelson, Bernard and Steiner, Gary A. *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Bobbitt, Franklin. "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City School Systems." *The Supervision of City Schools.* (Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913.

Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and the Authority Structure of the School." *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967.

Butler, Henry E., Jr. "Legal Implications of Concerted Action of Teachers." *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

——— and Button, H. Warren. "Historical Change of the Role of the Man in the Organization: 1865-1950," *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*. (Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Campbell, Roald F., Corbally, John E., Jr., and Ramseyer, John A. *Introduction to Educational Administration*. (Third edition) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

———, Cunningham, Luvern L., and McPhee, Roderick F. *The Organization and Control of American Schools*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.

Cartwright, Darwin and Zander, Alvin (eds.) *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. (Second edition) Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960.

Chapple, Elliot and Sayles, Leonard. *The Measure of Management*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1961.

Cooper, Dan H. "School Surveys." *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1960.

Crowley, Francis J. and Cohen, Martin. *Statistics*. New York: Collier Books, 1963.

Dill, William R. "Decision-Making." *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*. (Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chapter 9) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Etzioni, Amitai. *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Fayol, Henri. *General and Industrial Management*. London: Sir Issac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949.

Follett, Mary Parker. *Creative Experience*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1924.

Garrett, Henry E. *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. (Sixth ed.) New York: David MacKay Company, Inc., 1966.

Gerth, H. H. and Mills, C. Wright (trans. and eds.) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1946.

Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," *Administrative Theory in Education*. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: The Midwest Administrative Center, Univ. of Chicago, 1958.

Griffin, John I. *Statistics: Methods and Applications*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administration as Decision-Making," *Administrative Theory in Education*. Edited by Andrew W. Halpern. Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center, Univ. of Chicago, '958.

———. *Administrative Theory*. Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1959.

Gronlund, Norman E. *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1965.

Guilford, J. P. *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education* (Third edition) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Gulick, Luther. "Notes on the Theory of Organization." *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

Halpin, Andrew W. *Administrative Theory in Education*. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: The Midwest Administrative Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

———. "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior." *Administrative Behavior in Education*. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

———. *The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents*. Columbus: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1956.

———. *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.

Houle, Cyril O. "The Functions of Governing Boards in the Administration of Large Enterprises." *Excellence in Administration: The Dynamics of Leadership*. Stanford, Calif.: School of Education, Stanford University, 1962.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Lieberman, Myron. *The Future of Public Education.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

——— and Moskow, Michael H. *Collective Negotiations for Teachers.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

March, James G. and Simon, Herbert A. *Organizations.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Mayo, Elton. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization.* Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1946.

Metcalf, Henry C. and Urwick, L. (eds.) *Dynamic Administration.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Ohm, Robert E. "Collective Negotiations: Implications for Research." *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967.

Presthus, Robert. *The Organizational Society.* New York: A Division of Random House, 1965.

Roethlesberger, Fritz J. and Dickson, William J. *Management and the Worker.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Sears, Jesse B. *The Nature of the Administrative Process.* New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1950.

Selltiz, Clair; Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W. *Research Methods in Social Relations.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959.

Siegel, Sidney. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.* New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior.* (Second edition) New York: MacMillan Company, 1957.

Stotland, Ezra. "Peer Groups and Reactions to Power Figures." Edited by Darwin Cartwright. *Studies in Social Power.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1959.

Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization." *The Social Science of Organizations.* Edited by Harold J. Leavitt. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.

Tead, Ordway. *Art of Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951.

Thompson, Victor A. *Modern Organization.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1963.

Villers, Raymond. *Dynamic Management in Industry.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960.

Walton, Richard E. and McKersie, Robert B. *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* Trans. by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1947.

Wildman, Wesley A. "The Nature and Dynamics of Teacher Organization-School Administration Negotiating Activities and Their Impact on School Administration." *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967.

Zaleznick, Abraham and Moment, David. *Casebook on Interpersonal Behavior in Organizations.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Periodicals

Argyris, Chris. "The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment," *"Administrative Science Quarterly,* 2, 1957, p. 20.

Cock, Lester and French, John, Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change," *Human Relations.* Vol. I, No. 4 (August, 1948), 512-523.

Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," *The School Review,* No. 65 (Winter, 1957), 413-441.

Hoppock, Robert. "What Teachers Think of School Administrators," *School Executive,* Vol. 69, No. 3 (Nov., 1949), 40-42.

Litchfield, Edward H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly,* No. 1 (June, 1956), 3-29.

Livingston, Robert T. "The Theory of Organization and Management," *Transactions of the ASME* (May, 1953), 659.

McCamy, James L. "An Analysis of the Process of Decision-Making," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter, 1947), 41.
Mosier, Richard H. "What is Negotiable?", *School Management*, 10 (September, 1966), 163.
Parsons, Talcott. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1926), 66.
Perry, Charles A. and Wildman, Wesley A. "A Survey of Collectivity Activity Among Public School Teachers," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 2 (Spring, 1966), 133.
Rhodes, Eric. "How to Negotiate With Your Teachers—Without Surrendering," *School Management*, 10 (September, 1966), 113-114.
"The Teacher and Policy Making," *Administrator's Notebook*, Vol. I, No. 1 (May, 1952).
"Who Should Make What Decisions?" *Administrator's Notebook*, Vol. 3, No. 8 (April, 1955), 4.
Wildman, Wesley A. "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. XLVI, No. 4 (Dec., 1964), 154.
——— and Perry, Charles A. "Group Conflict and School Organization," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. XLVII, No. 5 (January, 1966), 245.

Reports

American Federation of Teachers. *Convention Proceedings* (abridged), Forty-Seventh Annual Convention. Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, 1923.
American Association of School Administrators. *Roles, Responsibilities, and Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent and Staff*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1963.
Constitution of the American Federation of Teachers. Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, October, 1964.
Hipp, Frederick W. "The Challenge to State Leadership in Solving Problems of State Associations." Speech given at Conference of Presidents and Executive Secretaries of State Educational Associations, New York City, June 25, 1965.
National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. *Guidelines for Professional Sanctions*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963.
National Education Association. *Guidelines for Professional Negotiation*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.
National Education Association. *NEA Handbook*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.
National School Boards Association. "Beliefs and Policies," *National School Boards Association*. Information Service Bulletin, III, No. 2 (June, 1965).
Whyte, William Foote. *Leadership and Group Participation*. Bulletin No. 24, Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, (May, 1953).

Unpublished Material

Seaberg, John J. Jr. "Analysis of the Conflict Between School Administration and NEA and AFT Affiliates in New Mexico." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1967.
Ulibarri, Horacio. "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959.